

REMARKS

Claim 1-84 are pending.

Claims 1-19, 21-41, 46-63 and 65-83 are allowed.

Claims 20, 42, 64 and 84 are rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The office action indicates that the specification is non-enabling for those claims (20, 42, 64 and 84) reciting a remote vehicle that is configured to operate in at least a partial vacuum. The office action states that the applicant “has not disclosed ... how to use rotors to provide lift or propulsion or directional control in a vacuum or in what is substantially a vacuum.” The specification is objected to for the same reason.

The rejection and objection are respectfully traversed. Paragraph 61 states the principles used for controlling and/or providing power to the remote-controlled vehicle are equally applicable to vehicles other than airborne vehicles. One example is a space-based vehicle configured to operate in a partial vacuum. Thus, the specification provides support for vehicles that can operate in at least a partial vacuum.

There is no basis for limiting claims 20, 42, 64 and 84 to rotor-driven vehicles. These claims recite a remote vehicle that is configured to operate in at least a partial vacuum. The claims from which they depend (claims 1, 23, 45 and 69) are not limited to rotor-driven vehicles.

The specification clearly provides support for vehicles that operate in at least a partial vacuum. Therefore, withdrawal of the ‘112 rejection and the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss any remaining issues before mailing another office action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/

Hugh P. Gortler

Reg. No. 33,890

(949) 454-0898

Date: Dec. 17, 2008